Bell nonlocality and fully-entangled fraction measured in an entanglement-swapping device without quantum state tomography

Karol Bartkiewicz,[1,2,*] Karel Lemr,[2,†] Antonín Černoch,[3,‡] and Adam Miranowicz[1,§]

[1] *Faculty of Physics, Adam Mickiewicz University, PL-61-614 Poznań, Poland*
[2] *RCPTM, Joint Laboratory of Optics of Palacký University and Institute of Physics of Czech Academy of Sciences, 17. listopadu 12, 771 46 Olomouc, Czech Republic*
[3] *Institute of Physics of the Czech Academy of Sciences, Joint Laboratory of Optics of PU and IP AS CR, 17. listopadu 50A, 772 07 Olomouc, Czech Republic*

(Dated: October 3, 2016)

We demonstrate an efficient experimental procedure based on entanglement swapping to determine the Bell nonlocality measure of Horodecki et al. [Phys. Lett. A **200**, 340 (1995)] and the fully-entangled fraction of Bennett et al. [Phys. Rev. A **54**, 3824 (1996)] of an arbitrary two-qubit polarization-encoded state. The nonlocality measure corresponds to the amount of the violation of the Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt (CHSH) optimized over all measurement settings. By using simultaneously two copies of a given state, we measure directly only six parameters. Our method requires neither full quantum state tomography of 15 parameters nor continuous scanning of the measurement bases used by two parties in the usual CHSH inequality tests with four measurements in each optimization step. We analyze how well the measured degrees of Bell nonlocality and other entanglement witnesses (including the fully-entangled fraction and a nonlinear entropic witness) of an arbitrary two-qubit state can estimate its entanglement. In particular, we measured these witnesses and estimated the negativity of various two-qubit Werner states. Our approach could especially be useful for quantum communication protocols based on entanglement swapping.

PACS numbers: 42.50.-p, 42.50.Dv, 42.50.Ex

arXiv:1609.09653v1 [quant-ph] 30 Sep 2016

Experimental methods for detecting and quantifying quantum entanglement [1, 2] and Bell nonlocality (usually identified with the violation of a Bell inequality) [3, 4] are of paramount importance for practical quantum-information processing [5], quantum cryptography (e.g., quantum key distribution) [6], and quantum communication (e.g., quantum teleportation) [7]. The importance of this topic can be highlighted by the fact that the world's first quantum satellite, emitting pairs of entangled photons, has recently been launched [8]. Since the seminal experiments of Aspect *et al.* [9–11] in the early 1980s, various methods of detecting entanglement and nonlocality have been developed (for reviews see [12, 13]). Note that only very recently loophole-free tests of Bell nonlocality have been performed [14, 15]. Nevertheless, to measure a degree of these effects seems to be much more difficult and important rather than only to detect them.

Thus, the question arises how to determine some entanglement or nonlocality measures, e.g., for only two qubits. These can include: (i) the negativity N, related to the Peres-Horodecki inseparability criterion [16, 17], which is a measure of the entanglement cost under the operations preserving the positivity of the partial transpose of a state [18, 19]; moreover, the negativity is an estimator of entanglement dimensionality, i.e., the number of the entangled degrees of freedom of two subsystems [20]; (ii) the concurrence C, corresponding to the entanglement of formation [21]; or (iii) the Bell nonlocality measure B of Ref. [22–25] corresponding the violation of the Bell inequality derived by Clauser, Horne, Shimony, and Holt (CHSH) [26], which is optimized over all measurements (i.e., detector settings) on sides A (Alice) and B (Bob). We note that these measures are equivalent as $N = C = B$ for, e.g., entangled pure states and these states subjected to phase damping (i.e., a special kind of Bell diagonal states) [24, 27].

One could argue that the most straightforward experimental method for quantifying entanglement and nonlocality is to perform a complete quantum-state tomography (QST) to determine a given bipartite state ρ and, then, to calculate (from ρ) its entanglement and nonlocality measures related to a specific quantum-information task. However, for the simplest case of two qubits in a general mixed state ρ, at least 15 (types of) measurements should be performed on identical copies of ρ to determine all 16 real parameters of ρ. Now the question arises whether a measure of entanglement or nonlocality could be determined directly or at least by a smaller number of measurements corresponding to an incomplete QST.

Various theoretical proposals to efficiently detect and quantify entanglement and nonlocality were described in, e.g., Refs. [25, 28–34]. The first experimental direct measurement of a nonlinear entanglement witnesses was reported in [35]. While the first experimental determination of an entanglement measure (i.e., the concurrence, being equal to the negativity and the CHSH measure) for a two-qubit pure state was reported in Ref. [36]. Probably, the first experimental method for measuring a collective universal witness, as a conclusive entanglement de-

tection of any two-qubit mixed state (encoded in photon polarization), was proposed in Ref. [34]. Unfortunately, this method is much more complicated than QST and requires to erase some measured information to ensure its optimality. All these theoretical and experimental studies show the fundamental difficulties not only in quantifying, but even in conclusively detecting the entanglement and nonlocality of a two-qubit state without QST.

The CHSH inequality has been mostly used for detecting and quantifying [25] Bell nonlocality of two qubits. This can be done by determining, e.g., the nonlocality measure B corresponding to finding an optimal set of measurements for the correlated subsystems. If one deals with an unknown state, this approach requires applying all possible two-measurement settings for each qubit to find the optimal ones. However, as shown in [25], a more direct experimental procedure, which requires using only six-detector settings, can be applied to find the maximal violation of the CHSH inequality for an arbitrary unknown two-qubit state. To avoid implementing inefficient procedures to be optimized over all possible measurement bases, this alternative approach of Ref. [25] requires using simultaneously two copies of a given two-qubit state. The estimation of the amount of entanglement from the maximum violation of the CHSH inequality was studied in, e.g., [25].

In this paper, we experimentally implement a direct and efficient method to conclusively detect Bell nonlocality and to determine the CHSH measure for two-qubit mixed state without QST. In particular, for phase-damped two-qubit pure states, our method reduces to determining the concurrence and negativity.

Specifically, we report here the experimental implementation of our six-step measurement procedure for determining the Bell nonlocality measure M [where $B = \sqrt{\max(M,0)}$], defined in Eq. (4), with two copies of the investigated state and the singlet-state projection implemented by Hong-Ou-Mandel (anti-)coalescence (see, e.g., Refs. [25, 35, 37–41]). In our experiment, we use polarization-encoded qubits. Our approach utilizes only a single two-photon interference event, instead of two required for standard nonlinear approaches [35, 42]. However, we are able to measure the same nonlinear entropic entanglement witness, as in Refs. [35, 42], for subsystems of equal purity. Here we also measure a more sensitive entanglement witness, i.e., the fully-entangled fraction (FEF) f of a two-qubit state ρ, which is defined as [43]: $f(\rho) = \max_{|e\rangle}\langle e|\rho|e\rangle$, where the maximum is taken over all maximally-entangled states $|e\rangle$. The FEF has been shown to be a useful concept in describing realistic QIP protocols including dense coding, teleportation, entanglement swapping, quantum cryptography based on Bell's inequality and, in general, multiqubit entanglement (see, e.g., [43–53]). The experimental complexity of our method of measuring the optimal CHSH inequality violation and the FEF is comparable to that of measuring the collectibility witness of Refs. [54–56] and can be implemented with the same experimental resources. Note that, contrary to the FEF and nonlocality measure M, the usefulness of the collectibility witness is limited mainly to pure or almost pure states only [54–56]. In addition to measuring the Bell nonlocality measure, we can apply the same method to measure the maximum achievable fidelity and FEF.

Theoretical framework.— In our experiment we study photonic qubits encoded in polarization of single photons. The associated Pauli matrices are defined as $\sigma_1 = |D\rangle\langle D| - |A\rangle\langle A|$, $\sigma_2 = |L\rangle\langle L| - |R\rangle\langle R|$, $\sigma_3 = |H\rangle\langle H| - |V\rangle\langle V|$, where each capital letter corresponds to a particular polarization direction state (i.e., D for diagonal, A for antidiagonal, L for left-circular, R for right-circular, H for horizontal, and V for vertical polarizations). A general two-qubit state can be expressed in the Hilbert-Schmidt form as

$$\rho = \frac{1}{4}(I\otimes I + \vec{x}\cdot\vec{\sigma}\otimes I + I\otimes\vec{y}\cdot\vec{\sigma} + \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} T_{i,j}\,\sigma_i\otimes\sigma_j), \quad (1)$$

where $\vec{\sigma} = [\sigma_1,\sigma_2,\sigma_3]$. The elements of the Bloch vectors read as $x_i = \mathrm{Tr}[\rho(\sigma_i\otimes I)]$ and $y_i = \mathrm{Tr}[\rho(I\otimes\sigma_i)]$), respectively. Finally, the correlation matrix T is defined as $T_{i,j} = \mathrm{Tr}[\rho(\sigma_i\otimes\sigma_j)]$ for $i,j = 1,2,3$.

The CHSH inequality for a two-qubit state $\rho \equiv \rho_{ab}$ can be written as [12, 26]: $|\mathrm{Tr}\,(\rho\,\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{CHSH}})| \le 2$. The maximum possible average value of the CHSH operator [22] is

$$\max_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{CHSH}}} |\mathrm{Tr}\,(\rho\,\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{CHSH}})| = 2\sqrt{g(\rho)}, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{CHSH}} = \hat{a}\cdot\vec{\sigma}\otimes(\hat{b}+\hat{b}')\cdot\vec{\sigma} + a'\cdot\vec{\sigma}\otimes(\hat{b}-\hat{b}')\cdot\vec{\sigma}$ depends on real unit vectors $\hat{a},\hat{b},\hat{a}',\hat{b}'$. The function $g(\rho) = \mathrm{Tr}R - \min[\mathrm{eig}(R)] \le 2$ depends on the eigenvalues $\mathrm{eig}(R)$ of a real symmetric matrix $R \equiv T^T T$, which is described with only six parameters, e.g., $R_{i,j}$ with $i \ge j$. As shown in [25], these six elements can be measured directly using two copies of ρ (i.e., ρ_1 and ρ_2). This is a consequence of the following identity

$$R_{i,j} = \mathrm{Tr}\left[(\rho_{a_1b_1}\otimes\rho_{a_2b_2})S_{a_1a_2}\otimes(\sigma_i\otimes\sigma_j)_{b_1b_2}\right], \quad (3)$$

where $\rho_{a_1b_1} \equiv \rho_1$ and $\rho_{a_2b_2} \equiv \rho_2$ for the subsystems a and b, whereas the operator $S_{a_1a_2} = (I - 4|\Psi^-\rangle\langle\Psi^-|)_{a_1a_2}$ is given in terms of the singlet state $|\Psi^-\rangle = (|HV\rangle - |VH\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ and the two-qubit identity operation I. As follows from Eq. (2), the CHSH inequality $|\mathrm{Tr}\,(\rho\,\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{CHSH}})| \le 2$ is violated iff $f(\rho) > 1$. Here we apply the Horodecki measure of Bell (or CHSH) nonlocality defined as [17]:

$$M = g - 1 = \mathrm{Tr}R - \min[\mathrm{eig}(R)] - 1, \quad (4)$$

which is positive iff the CHSH inequality is violated and reaches its maximum $M = 1$ for maximally-entangled



FIG. 1. (Color online) Amount of entanglement measured with the negativity N [12, 57, 58] versus (a) the Bell nonlocality measure M, defined in Eq. (4), (b) the entropic witness E, given in Eq. (6), and (c) the FEF F, defined in Eq. (5), for 10^5 two-qubit states randomly generated by a Monte Carlo simulation. Entangled states for which an entanglement witness is successful in detecting inseparability are marked with light cyan dots. The entangled states that are ignored by the respective witness are marked with dark cyan dots. The Werner ($\mathcal{W}$), Horodecki ($\mathcal{H}$), and pure ($\mathcal{P}$) states, defined in Eq. (7), correspond to the upper solid, dashed, and lower solid curves, respectively. In particular, F allows detecting the entanglement of the Werner states $\mathcal{W}$ for the whole range of their mixing parameter $p > 1/3$. A given witness detects all the entangled states of the negativity above its respective threshold, i.e., $N_M = 0.5607$, $N_E = 0.4120$, and $N_F = 0.2071$.

states. Note that M is trivially related to the measure of Bell nonlocality $B = \sqrt{\max(M, 0)}$ studied in [24, 25, 27]. Moreover, we apply another entanglement witness, i.e. the (modified) FEF $F(\rho)$ defined as

$$F = 2f - 1 = \tfrac{1}{2}\left(\mathrm{Tr}\sqrt{R} - 1\right), \tag{5}$$

which is a rescaled version of the standard FEF $f(\rho)$ [47, 59, 60]. Note that $F < 0$ for all separable states and equals to the negativity for the Werner and pure states (see Fig. 1c). These FEFs correspond to the fidelity of various entanglement-assisted processes maximized over all possible local unitary operations. The FEF F detects more entangled states than both nonlocality measure M and another nonlinear entropic witness, measured in Ref. [35] and defined by

$$\begin{aligned} E &= 2(\mathrm{Tr}\rho_{ab}^2 - \min[\mathrm{Tr}\rho_a^2, \mathrm{Tr}\rho_b^2]) \\ &= \tfrac{1}{2}(\mathrm{Tr}R + |\mathrm{Tr}\rho_a^2 - \mathrm{Tr}\rho_b^2| - 1), \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

if considered separately (see Fig. 1). Note that $E = \frac{1}{2}(\mathrm{Tr}R - 1)$ for $\mathrm{Tr}\rho_a^2 = \mathrm{Tr}\rho_b^2$. The spectrum of R, used in the definition of F, is measured unavoidably while measuring $M = g(\rho) - 1$, which quantifies the optimal CHSH violation. Thus, the optimal CHSH inequality is fundamentally more powerful in detecting quantum entanglement than its original form in an unoptimized measurement basis.

The performance of a given entanglement witness can conveniently be studied with one-parameter ($0 \le p \le 1$) classes of states (see Fig. 1) including the Werner states $\mathcal{W}$ [27, 61], the Horodecki states $\mathcal{H}$ [17], and pure states $\mathcal{P}$ defined, respectively, as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}(p) &= \tfrac{(1-p)}{4} I + p|\Psi^-\rangle\langle\Psi^-|, \\ \mathcal{H}(p) &= p|HH\rangle\langle HH| + (1-p)|\Psi^-\rangle\langle\Psi^-|, \\ \mathcal{P}(p) &= (\sqrt{p}|HH\rangle + \sqrt{1-p}|VV\rangle)(\mathrm{H.c.}), \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where H.c. stands for the Hermitian conjugate of the preceding terms.

Experiment.— In our experiment we used a four-photon source shown in Fig. 2. This multiphoton source is pumped by the Coherent Mira femtosecond laser at repetition rate of 80 MHz. The wavelength of the pulses is then converted in the process of second-harmonic generation (SHG) to 413 nm. On average the mean power of the up-converted pumping beam is circa 300 mW. Next, the beam travels through a polarization-dispersion line (PDL) that compensates the polarization dispersion caused by the β-BaB_2O_4 crystals (BBO) used to create pairs of photons. The PDL was build by placing a half-wave plate (HWP) between two beam displacers (BDs). This construction allows us to tune the relative optical path of photons of selected polarization by tilting the BDs. The pumping beam then powers a BBO crystal cascade [62], which generates (in the process of type-I spontaneous parametric down-conversion) pairs of horizontally- and vertically-polarized photons. The polarization and phase of a single photon pair can be adjusted by setting the correct polarization of the pumping beam. The beam passes through a quarter-wave plate (QWP) before and after being reflected by a mirror. This QWP compensates the polarization dispersion in the BBO crystals, which are now pumped in the opposite direction and create a second pair of photons.

The created pairs of photons are reflected by axillary mirrors to Alice and Bob who process the relevant photons (a_1, a_2) and (b_1, b_2) from each pair, respectively. The polarizations of photons b_1 and b_2 are first rotated by QWPs and HWPs and then projected by polarizers (POLs) to match an eigenstate of $(\sigma_m \otimes \sigma_n)_{b_1 b_2}$. Next, the photons are coupled to single-mode fibers and detected. Photons a_1 and a_2 are coupled to fibers directly, and then overlapped on a balanced fiber beam



FIG. 2. (Color online) Experimental scheme for determining the Bell nonlocality measure M and the FEF F of polarization-encoded two-qubit states with linear optics via the elements of the R matrix, defined in Eq. (3). This setup consists of narrow-band filters (Fs), half-wave plates (HWPs), quarter-wave plates (QWPs), beam dividers (BDs), detectors (Ds), a fibre beam splitter (FBS), polarization controllers (PCs), lenses (Ls), BBO crystals, mirrors, and motorized-translation stages (M). Note that this is an entanglement-swapping device, where the swapping is implemented by the FBS. The setup is powered by a laser system described in the text. The polarization-dispersion line (PDL) compensates the polarization dispersion introduced by the BBO crystals in the four-photon-source module (4PS). In this module, two copies of a two-qubit state ρ_1 and ρ_2 are prepared in the modes (a_1, b_1) and (a_2, b_2), respectively. We name the last two modules as belonging to Alice and Bob, respectively. In Alice's module, qubit a_1 is overlapped on an 50:50 beam splitter with qubit a_2 to implement the measurement of $S_{a_1a_2} = (I - 4|\Psi^-\rangle\langle\Psi^-|)_{a_1a_2}$. In Bob's module, qubits b_1 and b_2 are projected onto the eigenstates of $(\sigma_i \otimes \sigma_j)_{b_1b_2}$ for $i \geq j$ and $i, j = 1, 2, 3$ by the respective polarizer (POL) and detected at the respective detector. The four-fold coincidence counts are then processed to estimate the values of $R_{i,j}$.

splitter (FBS) before being detected. Before entering the fibers photons a_1 and a_2 (b_1 and b_2) are filtered with 5 nm (10 nm) interference filters. Note that entanglement swapping in our setup can be implemented by the FBS.

The interference strength on the FBS is tuned by a proper choice of a fiber delay and by setting the right position of the motorized-translation stage (M) associated with the corresponding mirror in a four-photon source (4PS). For its two extreme settings, the FBS performs the projective measurements $I/2$ or $|\Psi^-\rangle\langle\Psi^-|$. However, the optical couplers collect photon pairs generated at random distances from each other in the BBO crystal due to its group-velocity dispersion. Thus, a fraction of photons r will not overlap on the FBS, but can be detected in the same time window of the detectors as the perfectly-overlapping photons, i.e., Alice performs $[\frac{r}{2}I + (1-r)|\Psi^-\rangle\langle\Psi^-|]_{a_1a_2}$ measurement. For each source configuration, we measure this fraction of noninteracting photons while calibrating the setup and setting the appropriate delays. Depending on the weight r, Alice performs a projection on a particular Werner state. Thus, the uncertainty of the obtained results is limited only by the number of the registered coincidences and the precision of determining the weight r. In this setup, we typically register one four-fold coincidence event in 5 minutes. We collected hundreds of such coincidences per a measurement setting. In our experiment we experimentally studied two kinds of two-qubit states, namely the pure separable states $\mathcal{P}(0) = |VV\rangle\langle VV|$, and the Werner states, defined in Eq. (7), which can be entangled even if $M < 0$ (see Fig. 3). In particular, we measured the maximally-entangled states $\mathcal{W}(1)$ and the completely-mixed state $\mathcal{W}(0)$. These states were prepared using the method described in Ref. [56]. The Werner states are particularly important for quantum technologies because entanglement purification schemes transform other states into the Werner states (see Ref. [63] and the references therein). Our measurement results for the Werner states are summarized in Fig. 3. In all these cases, we reconstructed matrices R and applied the maximum likelihood method to estimate their spectra. For the remaining experimental results and technical details see the Supplement [64].

Conclusions.— By applying the maximum likelihood method, we demonstrated that direct measurements of nonlinear entanglement witnesses [34, 35] could be made robust to experimental errors by exploiting the correlations between them. Our procedure is applicable if the mean experimental matrix $R^{(\mathrm{exp})}$ can be well approximated with its maximum likelihood estimate R [64]. This method could further be applied to improve the error robustness of entanglement measures [65].

Our Monte Carlo simulations also allowed us to compare the efficiency of our entanglement detection by means of the Bell nonlocality measure M, the FEF F, and the entropic witness E based on double Hong-Ou-Mandel interference, as described Ref. [35]. We measured the FEF F that is an entanglement witness more powerful in detecting entanglement than M and E. This was exemplified by our study of the Werner states. These states are recognized to be entangled by a particular entanglement witness if they have large enough value of the mixing parameter p (see Fig. 3). For the FEF F, this critical value is $p_F > \frac{1}{3}$, which corresponds to the range for which the Werner states are entangled. For the entropic witness E and Bell nonlocality measure M, the entanglement of the Werner states occurs if $p_E > 1/\sqrt{3}$ and $p_M > 1/\sqrt{2}$, respectively.

In our experiment, we have conducted a conclusive Bell nonlocality test by means of two-photon pairs prepared in the same state and six independent measurements in our entanglement-swapping device. In the orthodox CHSH approach, Alice and Bob perform two measurements on two copies of a given two-qubit state (four measurements



FIG. 3. (Color online) (a) The Bell nonlocality measure M, the FEF F and the entropic witness E versus the mixing parameter p of the Werner states $\mathcal{W}$. Our theoretical results for the perfect Werner states are marked with solid curves. The systematic deviation from the ideal case (solid curves) is caused by the fact that our experimentally-created singlet state was not ideally pure and its purity reached circa 93%. Moreover, our experimentally-created mixed state was not totally mixed. The ideal Werner are separable for $p < 1/3$. For these states the entanglement can be detected with the FEF F, entropic witness E, and Bell nonlocality M for $p_F > 1/3$, $p_E > 1/\sqrt{3}$, and $p_M > 1/\sqrt{2}$, respectively. The separable states enclosed by gray boundaries for the respective witnesses are shown in panel (b), where $[r_1, r_2, r_3] = \mathrm{eig}(R)$ and the Werner states are located on the diagonals. The entanglement is detected, if the respective witness is nonnegative.

in total). However, to determine the Bell nonlocality measure for an unknown state, they need to perform full QST or to optimize their measurement bases, which requires performing four measurements in each optimization step resulting in many more measurements than in our experiment.

Our method solves the problem of detecting and quantifying entanglement beyond a simple Bell test in a typical entanglement-swapping method [66], which can be applied to, e.g., quantum repeaters [67] and quantum relays [68] in device-independent quantum communications [69], as well as to entanglement-assisted quantum error correction [70] and entanglement purification [63].

We hope that our results could stimulate further research on measuring such nonlinear properties of quantum systems as entanglement and nonlocality without performing full quantum-state tomography.

Acknowledgements.— KL and KB acknowledge the financial support by the Czech Science Foundation under the project No. 16-10042Y and the financial support of the Polish National Science Centre under the grant No. DEC-2013/11/D/ST2/02638. AČ acknowledges the financial support by the Czech Science Foundation under the project No. P205/12/0382. The authors also acknowledge the project No. LO1305 of the Ministry of Education, Youth, and Sports of the Czech Republic financing the infrastructure of their workplace. AM acknowledges the support of a grant from the John Templeton Foundation.

* bark@amu.edu.pl
† k.lemr@upol.cz
‡ acernoch@fzu.cz
§ miran@amu.edu.pl

[1] E. Schrödinger, "Discussion of probability relations between separated systems," Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. **31**, 555 (1935).
[2] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, "Can Quantum-Mechanical Description of Physical Reality Be Considered Complete?" Phys. Rev. **47**, 777–780 (1935).
[3] J. S. Bell, "On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen Paradox," Physics **1**, 195 (1964).
[4] J. S. Bell, *Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge University Press, 2004).
[5] M. A Nielsen and I. L Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, 2010).
[6] A. K. Ekert, "Quantum cryptography based on Bell's theorem," Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 661–663 (1991).
[7] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, and W. K. Wootters, "Teleporting an unknown quantum state via dual classical and Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen channels," Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1895–1899 (1993).
[8] E. Gibney, "Chinese satellite is one giant step for the quantum internet," Nature **535**, 478–479 (2016).
[9] A. Aspect, P. Grangier, and G. Roger, "Experimental Tests of Realistic Local Theories via Bell's Theorem," Phys. Rev. Lett. **47**, 460–463 (1981).
[10] A. Aspect, P. Grangier, and G. Roger, "Experimental Realization of Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen-Bohm *Gedankenexperiment* : A New Violation of Bell's Inequalities," Phys. Rev. Lett. **49**, 91–94 (1982).
[11] A. Aspect, J. Dalibard, and G. Roger, "Experimental Test of Bell's Inequalities Using Time-Varying Analyzers," Phys. Rev. Lett. **49**, 1804–1807 (1982).
[12] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, "Quantum entanglement," Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 865–942 (2009).
[13] N. Brunner, D. Cavalcanti, S. Pironio, V. Scarani, and S. Wehner, "Bell nonlocality," Rev. Mod. Phys. **86**, 419–478 (2014).
[14] B. Hensen, H. Bernien, A. E. Dréau, A. Reiserer, N. Kalb, M. S. Blok, J. Ruitenberg, R. F. L. Vermeulen, R. N. Schouten, C. Abellán, W. Amaya, V. Pruneri, M. W. Mitchell, M. M.ham, D. J. Twitchen, D. Elkouss, *et al.*, "Loophole-free Bell inequality violation using electron spins separated by 1.3 kilometres," Nature (London) **526**,

682–686 (2015).
[15] L. K. Shalm, E. Meyer-Scott, B. G. Christensen, P. Bierhorst, M. A. Wayne, M. J. Stevens, T. Gerrits, S. Glancy, D. R. Hamel, M. S. Allman, K. J. Coakley, S. D. Dyer, C. Hodge, A. E. Lita, V. B. Verma, C. Lambrocco, *et al.*, "Strong Loophole-Free Test of Local Realism*," Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 250402 (2015).
[16] A. Peres, "Separability Criterion for Density Matrices," Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1413–1415 (1996).
[17] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, "Separability of mixed states: necessary and sufficient conditions," Phys. Lett. A **223**, 1 (1996).
[18] K. Audenaert, M. B. Plenio, and J. Eisert, "Entanglement Cost under Positive-Partial-Transpose-Preserving Operations," Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 027901 (2003).
[19] S. Ishizaka, "Binegativity and geometry of entangled states in two qubits," Phys. Rev. A **69**, 020301 (2004).
[20] C. Eltschka and J. Siewert, "Negativity as an Estimator of Entanglement Dimension," Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 100503 (2013).
[21] W. K. Wootters, "Entanglement of Formation of an Arbitrary State of Two Qubits," Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2245–2248 (1998).
[22] R. Horodecki, J. Horodecki, and M. Horodecki, "Violating Bell inequality by mixed spin-1/2 states: necessary and sufficient condition," Phys. Lett. A **200**, 340 (1995).
[23] R. Horodecki, "Two-spin-1/2 mixtures and Bell's inequalities," Phys. Lett. A **210**, 223 (1996).
[24] B. Horst, K. Bartkiewicz, and A. Miranowicz, "Two-qubit mixed states more entangled than pure states: Comparison of the relative entropy of entanglement for a given nonlocality," Phys. Rev. A **87**, 042108 (2013).
[25] K. Bartkiewicz, B. Horst, K. Lemr, and A. Miranowicz, "Entanglement estimation from Bell inequality violation," Phys. Rev. A **88**, 052105 (2013).
[26] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. A. Holt, "Proposed Experiment to Test Local Hidden-Variable Theories," Phys. Rev. Lett. **23**, 880–884 (1969).
[27] A. Miranowicz, "Violation of Bell inequality and entanglement of decaying Werner states," Physics Letters A **327**, 272–283 (2004).
[28] P. Horodecki and A. Ekert, "Method for Direct Detection of Quantum Entanglement," Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 127902 (2002).
[29] P. Horodecki, "Measuring Quantum Entanglement without Prior State Reconstruction," Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 167901 (2003).
[30] A. R. R. Carvalho, F. Mintert, and A. Buchleitner, "Decoherence and Multipartite Entanglement," Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 230501 (2004).
[31] F. Mintert, M. Kuś, and A. Buchleitner, "Concurrence of Mixed Multipartite Quantum States," Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 260502 (2005).
[32] H. A. Carteret, "Noiseless Quantum Circuits for the Peres Separability Criterion," Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 040502 (2005).
[33] L. Aolita and F. Mintert, "Measuring Multipartite Concurrence with a Single Factorizable Observable," Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 050501 (2006).
[34] K. Bartkiewicz, Paweł Horodecki, K. Lemr, A. Miranowicz, and K. Życzkowski, "Method for universal detection of two-photon polarization entanglement," Phys. Rev. A **91**, 032315 (2015).
[35] F. A. Bovino, G. Castagnoli, A. Ekert, P. Horodecki, C. M. Alves, and A. V. Sergienko, "Direct Measurement of Nonlinear Properties of Bipartite Quantum States," Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 240407 (2005).
[36] S. P. Walborn, P. H. Souto Ribeiro, L. Davidovich, F. Mintert, and A. Buchleitner, "Experimental determination of entanglement with a single measurement," Nature (London) **440**, 1022–1024 (2006).
[37] C. K. Hong, Z. Y. Ou, and L. Mandel, "Measurement of subpicosecond time intervals between two photons by interference," Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 2044–2046 (1987).
[38] K. Bartkiewicz, K. Lemr, A. Černoch, and J. Soubusta, "Measuring nonclassical correlations of two-photon states," Phys. Rev. A **87**, 062102 (2013).
[39] K. Bartkiewicz, K. Lemr, and A. Miranowicz, "Direct method for measuring of purity, superfidelity, and subfidelity of photonic two-qubit mixed states," Phys. Rev. A **88**, 052104 (2013).
[40] A. Miranowicz, K. Bartkiewicz, J. Peřina Jr., M. Koashi, N. Imoto, and F. Nori, "Optimal two-qubit tomography based on local and global measurements: Maximal robustness against errors as described by condition numbers," Phys. Rev. A **90**, 062123 (2014).
[41] K. Bartkiewicz, A. Černoch, K. Lemr, and A. Miranowicz, "Priority Choice Experimental Two-Qubit Tomography: Measuring One by One All Elements of Density Matrices," Sci. Rep. **6**, 19610 (2016).
[42] P. Xu, X. Yuan, L.-K. Chen, H. Lu, X.-C. Yao, C. Ma, Y.-A. Chen, and J.-W. Pan, "Implementation of a Measurement-Device-Independent Entanglement Witness," Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 140506 (2014).
[43] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, John A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, "Mixed-state entanglement and quantum error correction," Phys. Rev. A **54**, 3824–3851 (1996).
[44] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, "General teleportation channel, singlet fraction, and quasidistillation," Phys. Rev. A **60**, 1888–1898 (1999).
[45] S. Albeverio, S.-M. Fei, and W.-L. Yang, "Optimal teleportation based on Bell measurements," Phys. Rev. A **66**, 012301 (2002).
[46] Z.-W. Zhou and G.-C. Guo, "Disentanglement and inseparability correlation in a two-qubit system," Phys. Rev. A **61**, 032108 (2000).
[47] J. Grondalski, D. M. Etlinger, and D. F. V. James, "The fully entangled fraction as an inclusive measure of entanglement applications," Phys. Lett. A **300**, 573 (2002).
[48] Ş. K. Özdemir, K. Bartkiewicz, Y.-x. Liu, and A. Miranowicz, "Teleportation of qubit states through dissipative channels: Conditions for surpassing the no-cloning limit," Phys. Rev. A **76**, 042325 (2007).
[49] M. Li, S.-M. Fei, and Z.-X. Wang, "Upper bound of the fully entangled fraction," Phys. Rev. A **78**, 032332 (2008).
[50] S. Lee and J. Park, "Monogamy of entanglement and teleportation capability," Phys. Rev. A **79**, 054309 (2009).
[51] M.-J. Zhao, Z.-G. Li, S.-M. Fei, and Z.-X. Wang, "A note on fully entangled fraction," J. Phys. A **43**, 275203 (2010).
[52] Z.-G. Li, M.-J. Zhao, S.-M. Fei, H. Fan, and W.-M. Liu, "Mixed maximally entangled states," Quantum Inf. Comp. **12**, 63–73 (2012).
[53] M.-J. Zhao, "Maximally entangled states and fully entangled fraction," Phys. Rev. A **91**, 012310 (2015).
[54] Ł. Rudnicki, P. Horodecki, and K. Życzkowski, "Collec-

tive Uncertainty Entanglement Test," Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 150502 (2011).
[55] Ł. Rudnicki, Z. Puchała, P. Horodecki, and K. Życzkowski, "Collectibility for mixed quantum states," Phys. Rev. A **86**, 062329 (2012).
[56] K. Lemr, K. Bartkiewicz, and A. Černoch, "Experimental measurement of the collectibility of two-qubit states," arXiv:1602.04852 [quant-ph] (2016).
[57] K. Życzkowski, P. Horodecki, A. Sanpera, and M. Lewenstein, "Volume of the set of separable states," Phys. Rev. A **58**, 883–892 (1998).
[58] G. Vidal and R. F. Werner, "Computable measure of entanglement," Phys. Rev. A **65**, 032314 (2002).
[59] R. Horodecki and M. Horodecki, "Information-theoretic aspects of inseparability of mixed states," Phys. Rev. A **54**, 1838–1843 (1996).
[60] P. Badziąg, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, "Local environment can enhance fidelity of quantum teleportation," Phys. Rev. A **62**, 012311 (2000).
[61] R. F. Werner, "Quantum states with Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen correlations admitting a hidden-variable model," Phys. Rev. A **40**, 4277–4281 (1989).
[62] P. G. Kwiat, E. Waks, A. G. White, I. Appelbaum, and P. H. Eberhard, "Ultrabright source of polarization-entangled photons," Phys. Rev. A **60**, R773–R776 (1999).
[63] J.-W. Pan, C. Simon, C. Brukner, and A. Zeilinger, "Entanglement purification for quantum communication," Nature (London) **410**, 1067–1070 (2001).
[64] See Supplemental Material for experimental details including an extra figure and measurement results.
[65] K. Bartkiewicz, J. Beran, K. Lemr, M. Norek, and A. Miranowicz, "Quantifying entanglement of a two-qubit system via measurable and invariant moments of its partially transposed density matrix," Phys. Rev. A **91**, 022323 (2015).
[66] M. Żukowski, A. Zeilinger, M. A. Horne, and A. K. Ekert, ""Event-ready-detectors" Bell experiment via entanglement swapping," Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 4287–4290 (1993).
[67] W. Dür, H.-J. Briegel, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, "Quantum repeaters based on entanglement purification," Phys. Rev. A **59**, 169–181 (1999).
[68] C. Varnava, R. M. Stevenson, J. Nilsson, J. Skiba-Szymanska, B. Dzurňák, M. Lucamarini, R. V. Penty, I. Farrer, D. A. Ritchie, and A. J. Shields, "An entangled-LED-driven quantum relay over 1 km," npj Quantum Information **2**, 16006 (2016).
[69] M. Curty and T. Moroder, "Heralded-qubit amplifiers for practical device-independent quantum key distribution," Phys. Rev. A **84**, 010304 (2011).
[70] T. Brun, I. Devetak, and M.-H. Hsieh, "Correcting quantum errors with entanglement," Science **314**, 436–439 (2006).

arXiv:1609.09653v1 [quant-ph] 30 Sep 2016

Bell nonlocality and fully-entangled fraction measured in an entanglement-swapping device without quantum state tomography: Supplemental Material

Karol Bartkiewicz,[1,2,*] Karel Lemr,[2,†] Antonín Černoch,[3,‡] and Adam Miranowicz[1,§]

[1] *Faculty of Physics, Adam Mickiewicz University, PL-61-614 Poznań, Poland*
[2] *RCPTM, Joint Laboratory of Optics of Palacký University and Institute of Physics of Czech Academy of Sciences, 17. listopadu 12, 771 46 Olomouc, Czech Republic*
[3] *Institute of Physics of the Czech Academy of Sciences, Joint Laboratory of Optics of PU and IP AS CR, 17. listopadu 50A, 772 07 Olomouc, Czech Republic*

(Dated: October 3, 2016)

Here we describe additional experimental details including the maximum likelihood method, which ensures the positivity of the reconstructed correlation matrix R, the directly measured matrices (including the separable state $|VV\rangle$), and other methods related to the inseparable Werner states. We also plotted the measured values of the relevant entanglement witnesses.

Experimentally measured matrices

The experimentally obtained matrices $\mathcal{R}^{(\mathrm{exp})} \equiv R^{(\mathrm{exp})} \pm \delta R^{(\mathrm{exp})}$ for the assorted states read as

$$\mathcal{R}^{(\mathrm{exp})}_{\mathrm{sep}} = \begin{bmatrix} \overline{.099} \pm .108 & \overline{.088} \pm .109 & \overline{.124} \pm .109 \\ \cdots & \overline{.034} \pm .108 & \overline{.113} \pm .108 \\ \cdots & \cdots & .980 \pm .147 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\mathcal{R}^{(\mathrm{exp})}_{\mathrm{mix}} = \begin{bmatrix} .017 \pm .031 & .006 \pm .031 & \overline{.007} \pm .031 \\ \cdots & .013 \pm .033 & .016 \pm .033 \\ \cdots & \cdots & .006 \pm .029 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\mathcal{R}^{(\mathrm{exp})}_{\mathrm{ent}} = \begin{bmatrix} .990 \pm .115 & .077 \pm .087 & .008 \pm .087 \\ \cdots & .985 \pm .110 & \overline{.013} \pm .110 \\ \cdots & \cdots & .959 \pm .079 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\overline{x} = -x$ and $\delta R^{(\mathrm{exp})}_{i,j}$ are their experimental errors.

Maximum likelihood method

To ensure the positivity of the reconstructed matrices, we use the maximum likelihood method developed for quantum state tomography (see, e.g., [1]). We find the physical matrix $R = [R_{i,j}]$, which is the closest to the experimental but unphysical matrix $R^{\mathrm{exp}} = [R^{(\mathrm{exp})}_{i,j}]$, by maximizing the logarithmic likelihood function

$$\mathcal{L} = -\sum_{1 \le i \le j}^{3} \left(\frac{R^{(\mathrm{exp})}_{i,j} - R_{i,j}}{\delta R^{(\mathrm{exp})}_{i,j}} \right)^2 \qquad (1)$$

subject to $0 \le r_j \le 1$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$ and $[r_1, r_2, r_3] = \mathrm{eig}(R)$. This condition is equivalent to requiring the probabilities of coincidence detections to be defined properly in any basis. Our maximum likelihood estimates read as

$$R_{\mathrm{sep}} \approx \begin{bmatrix} .008 & .008 & \overline{.086} \\ \cdots & .008 & \overline{.091} \\ \cdots & \cdots & .982 \end{bmatrix}, \; R_{\mathrm{mix}} \approx \begin{bmatrix} .018 & .004 & \overline{.004} \\ \cdots & .015 & .011 \\ \cdots & \cdots & .010 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$R_{\mathrm{ent}} \approx \begin{bmatrix} .963 & .038 & .010 \\ \cdots & .961 & \overline{.012} \\ \cdots & \cdots & .959 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The corresponding spectra calculated for the exact maximum likelihood estimates are $\mathrm{eig}(R_{\mathrm{mix}}) = [0.019, 0.000, 0.024]$, $\mathrm{eig}(R_{\mathrm{ent}}) = [0.919, 1.000, 0.965]$ and $R_{\mathrm{sep}} = [0.000, 0.998, 0.000]$.

The matrices R are shifted on average by a fraction of 0.19, 0.02, 0.07 of $\delta R^{(\mathrm{exp})}$ from $R^{(\mathrm{exp})}$ for the pure separable, maximally mixed, and singlet states, respectively. Thus, we can assume that $R^{(\mathrm{exp})} \approx R$. The largest errors occur for the pure states. This is because the state is aligned with only one of the eigenstates for the measurement apparatus. In this case, we observe relatively low coincidence rates for the other eigenstates of the apparatus. Each matrix element $R_{i,j}$ depends on four projections onto eigenstates of $\sigma_i \otimes \sigma_j$ performed simultaneously by Bob.

Measured entanglement witnesses

Our maximum likelihood estimates were used to calculate the values of the entanglement witnesses as summarized in Fig. S1 and Tab. I. The errors introduced by the setup were estimated by comparing the results of the measured etalon states ($|VV\rangle$ and $I/4$) with the theoretical predictions.

The Werner states

The spectrum of $R_{\mathcal{W}}$ matrix of the Werner states can be expressed as $\mathrm{eig}(R_{\mathcal{W}}) \approx p^2 \mathrm{eig}(R_{\mathrm{ent}}) + (1-p)^2 \mathrm{eig}(R_{\mathrm{mix}})$. This is approximation is valid if $\mathrm{eig}(R_{\mathrm{ent}}) \gg \mathrm{eig}(R_{\mathrm{mix}}) \approx 0$ and the resulting $\mathrm{Tr}\sqrt{R_{\mathcal{W}}}$ is linearly dependent on the mixing parameter p [for the ideal Werner states $F = (3p-1)/2$].

TABLE I. The experimentally and theoretically obtained values of the Bell nonlocality measure M [Eq. (4)], entropic witness E [Eq. (6)], and FEF F [Eq. (5)].

Density matrix	$M^{(\text{experiment})}$	$E^{(\text{experiment})}$	$F^{(\text{experiment})}$	$M^{(\text{theory})}$	$E^{(\text{theory})}$	$F^{(\text{theory})}$
$\|\Psi^-\rangle\langle\Psi^-\|$	$+0.965 \pm 0.043$	$+0.942 \pm 0.022$	$+0.970 \pm 0.031$	$+1$	$+1$	$+1$
$\|VV\rangle\langle VV\|$	-0.002 ± 0.043	-0.001 ± 0.022	-0.001 ± 0.08	0	0	0
$I/4$	-0.957 ± 0.043	-0.478 ± 0.022	-0.353 ± 0.141	-1	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$



FIG. S1. (Color online) Experimentally and theoretically obtained values of the Bell nonlocality measure M [Eq. (4)], the entropic witness E [Eq. (6)], and the FEF F [Eq. (5)]. The bright (dark) bars correspond to theoretical (experimental) values. The associated uncertainties are marked by red frames.

* bark@amu.edu.pl
† k.lemr@upol.cz
‡ acernoch@fzu.cz
§ miran@amu.edu.pl

[1] D. F. V. James, P. G. Kwiat, W. J. Munro, and A. G. White, "Measurement of qubits," Phys. Rev. A **64**, 052312 (2001).